REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner has not attached an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form references that were mailed to the USPTO on July 8, 2005. The Examiner also did not indicate the references on the PTO-1449 form(s) were not in conformance with MPEP § 609. As such, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate that these references have been considered and made of record.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 are pending. No claims are currently amended. No claims are canceled. No claims are added. No new matter has been added.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,704 to McCanne (hereinafter "McCanne.2") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,320 to Horikawa et al. (hereinafter "Horikawa"). As a matter of clarification, page 2 of the Office Action refers to § 102(e), but the heading and cited code section both refer to § 103(a); accordingly, Applicant responds to this rejection as a rejection under § 103(a).

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,323 to McCanne (hereinafter "McCanne") in view of Horikawa.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCanne in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,314,088 to Yamano et al. (hereinafter "Yamano").

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over one or more combinations of McCanne.2, Horikawa, McCanne, and/or Yamano. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because the combinations of cited references fail to disclose all of the limitations of the claims.

CLAIMS 1 and 3-6

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCanne.2 in view of Horikawa. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of cited references because McCanne.2 and Horikawa, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 1 recites:

> A method, comprising:
> receiving, at an information object repository, a request for an information object at an address identified by a uniform resource locator (URL);
> mapping the URL to a corresponding anycast address for the information object;
> resolving the anycast address for the information object to a unicast address for the information object, wherein resolving the anycast address comprises **sending an anycast resolution query according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP)**; and
> obtaining a copy of the information object at the corresponding unicast address.
> (Emphasis added).

In support of the rejection, the Office Action states, in part:

> Horikawa discloses **resolving an anycast address by sending a request (query) to the anycast address** [column 5 <<lines 5-37>>], whereby a correlated unicast address is returned [column 5 <<lines 59-66>>].
> Office Action, 6/19/06, p. 3 (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's characterization of the prior art because the combination of McCanne.2 and Horikawa, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim. In particular, the combination of cited references does not teach or suggest sending an anycast resolution query according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP).

The Office Action correctly recognizes that McCanne.2 does not teach sending an anycast resolution query according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP). Office Action, 6/19/06, p. 3.

Horikawa does not cure this lack of teaching by McCanne.2. Horikawa is directed to an address resolution method using an NBMA Next Hop Resolution Protocol (NHRP) on an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) network. Horikawa, col. 1, lines 7-10. The address resolution method is implemented to accommodate physical movement of an NHRP server and an ATM terminal. Horikawa, col. 1, lines 11-15. In order to facilitate this address resolution method, a functional anycast address is used. Horikawa, col. 2, lines 53-60. However, the use of an anycast address does not necessarily mean that an anycast resolution query is used. In fact, Horikawa appears to merely disclose sending an NHRP register packet to an NHS based on the anycast address. Horikawa, col. 5, lines 15-16. There is no indication that the NHRP register packet is an anycast resolution query. Since Horikawa does not teach an anycast resolution query, it follows that Horikawa does not teach or suggest using an anycast address resolution protocol. Horikawa merely teaches using the NHRP protocol, which is not described or taught as an anycast address resolution protocol. Moreover, Horikawa does not teach the NHRP protocol having any function related to anycast address resolution. Given that Horikawa does not teach an anycast resolution query or an anycast address resolution protocol, Horikawa does not disclose the limitation of sending an anycast resolution query according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP).

In contrast, claim 1 recites "sending an anycast resolution query according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP)." For the reasons stated above, McCanne.2 fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. In particular, the combination of McCanne.2 and Horikawa does not teach or suggest sending an anycast resolution query according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP).

Additionally, although the Office Action's reference to returning a correlated unicast address to the communicating party may be inapposite to the subject matter of the claim, Applicant respectfully notes that this further mischaracterization of Horikawa is indicative of the Office Action's loose and inaccurate interpretation of the prior art. Horikawa does not teach returning a correlated unicast address, but rather merely teaches

that the NHRP server (NHS) registers an IP address and the ATM address in the NHS's own register. Horikawa, col. 5, lines 26-32. Although the IP address and ATM address are derived from the NHRP register packet sent from the ATM terminal, Horikawa does not teach returning the IP address from the NHS to the ATM terminal. Thus, the Office Action's assertion that "a correlated unicast address is returned" is inaccurate according to the teachings of Horikawa.

Given that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Given that claims 3-6 depends from independent claim 1, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 3-6 are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CLAIMS 7-9 AND 11-14

Claims 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over one or more combinations of McCanne.2, Horikawa, McCanne, and/or Yamano for similar reasons to the rejection of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 9 are patentable over the cited references because the combinations of cited references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim. Claims 7 and 9 recite the limitation "to send an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP)." While any interpretation of claim 7 or claim 9 is dependent only the language of the claim, and not on the language of each other or other claims, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 9 are patentable at least for similar reasons are described above. Namely, Horikawa does not teach or suggest the limitation to send and anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Given that claim 8 depends from claim 7 and claims 11-14 depend from independent claim 9, which are patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 8 and 11-14 are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 18, 2006

Marina Portnova
Reg. No. 45,750

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300